(1) 15.12 (3)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR CHHATTISGARH

Single Bench

CIVIL REVISION NO. - 147 **OF 2005**

PETITIONER – Smt. Sarswati Thakur, W/o Late Kamal Singh Thakur, aged about 35 years, Resident of – Naharpara, Police Sation- Ganj, Raipur, Tehsil and District – Raipur

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. Mohammed Rahis @ Mohammed Rais, Occupation- Driver, S/o Abdul Aziz, aged about 24 years, Resident of – Railway Coloney, Dallirajhara, Police Station- Dallirajhara, Tehsil – Balod, District - Durg (C.G.)

2. Ashraf Memon (Vehicle Owner) S/o Abdul Sattar, aged about 32 years , Resident of – Village- Kusumkasa, Police Station- Dallirajhara, Tehsil Balod, Dist Durg (C.G.)

3. The New India Insurance Company Limited , through Divisional Manager, Divisional Office, The New India Insurance Company Limited Madina Building, Kutchery Chowk , Medical College Road, Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

P.R. No. 3196/05
Presented by Shri Shivendra Pandey
19/12/05

MEMO OF CIVIL REVISION UNDER SECTION 115 OF CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक C.R. No. 147/05 सन् ~~200~~

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	20.12.2005 **Shri Shivendu Pandya, learned counsel for the applicant.** **The applicant has preferred this revision against the order dated 24.11.2005 by 14th Additional Motor Accident Claims Tribunal (FTC), Raipur in Claim Case No. 79/2004 and by which the application of the applicant for release of Rs. 50,000/- from her fixed deposit account has been rejected.** **Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the application was rejected solely on the ground that the applicant has already withdrawn Rs. 1,00,000/- from her fixed deposit account in the span of three-four months and the reason for withdrawal is not sufficient. However the applicant who is a qualified lady bonafidely needs the above amount of Rs. 50,000/- to repay her loan and the applicant is facing hardships.** **Taking into consideration that the applicant has already been paid Rs. 1,00,000/- and total amount of Rs.50,000/- is balance in the fixed deposit account, I do not find any illegality in the impugned order which calls for interference in the revisional jurisdiction and accordingly the revision is rejected.** **Consequently I.A. No. 3338/2005 stands disposed of.** **Sd/-** **Dhirendra Mishra** **Judge**	

[पीछे देखिये